

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being filed via
EFS-Web with the United States Patent and Trademark Office
on February 13, 2008.

PATENT
Docket No.: 015358-008700US
Client Ref. No.: ID-RII-300

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP

By: /Maureen Golob/
Maureen Golob

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:

Lee et al.

Application No.: 10/722,834

Filed: November 26, 2003

For: TECHNIQUES FOR
INTEGRATING NOTE-TAKING AND
MULTIMEDIA INFORMATION

Customer No. 20350

Confirmation No.: 8170

Examiner: Nicholas R. Taylor

Art Unit: 2141

**STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF
INTERVIEW**

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Applicants would like to thank Examiner Nicholas Taylor and Examiner Nguyen (SPE) for the telephonic interview regarding this application conducted on February 11, 2008.

The interview participants were Examiners Nicholas Taylor and Nguyen (SPE) and Applicant's representative Sujit B. Kotwal (Reg. No. 43,336).

The rejection raised in the Final Office Action dated December 13, 2007 of claims 1, 8 and 15 based upon references Chiu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,452,615) and King et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,721,288) were discussed.

With regards to claim 1, Applicant explained the differences between the invention recited in claim 1 and references Chiu et al. and King et al. The Examiners understood the novel features of the claim 1 and suggested amendments to further clarify the differences from Chiu et al. and King et al. Applicant has amended claim 1 per the

Examiners' suggestions. The claim amendments and the patentability arguments that were discussed are documented in the Amendment being filed with this Statement.

With regards to claim 8, Applicant explained how embedding information in a notes document was different from merely including a link in a document as described in Chiu. Applicant agreed to amend claim 8, as suggested by the Examiners, to further clarify the differences from Chiu et al. and King et al.. The claim amendments and the patentability arguments that were discussed are documented in the Amendment being filed with this Statement.

With regards to claim 15, the Applicant explained differences between features recited in claim 1 and the teachings of Chiu et al. The Examiners appeared to agree with the Applicant that the features of claim 15 were not taught or suggested by Chiu et al. The patentability arguments for claim 15 are documented in the Amendment being filed with this Statement.

The Examiners recommended that the Applicant file a response to the Final Office Action that Examiner Taylor would consider. Accordingly, an Amendment response is being filed herewith.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-324-6365.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sujit B. Kotwal/

Sujit B. Kotwal
Reg. No. 43,336

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: (415) 576-0200
Fax: (415) 576-0300
SBK:mg
61281964 v1